arXiv:1406.6222v3 [math.PR] 28 Sep 2014

Law of large numbers for random walk with unbounded jumps and BDP with bounded jumps in random environment*

Hua-Ming WANG[a]

[a]Department of Mathematics, Anhui Normal University, Wuhu 241003, China

E-mail : hmking@mail.ahnu.edu.cn

Abstract

We study random walk with unbounded jumps in random environment. The environment is stationary and ergodic, uniformly elliptic and decays polynomially with speed $Dj^{-(3+\varepsilon_0)}$ for some small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and proper $D > 0$. We prove a law of large number with positive velocity under the condition that the annealed mean of the hitting time of the positive half lattice is finite. Secondly, we consider birth and death process with bounded jumps in stationary and ergodic environment. Under the uniformly elliptic condition, we prove a law of large number and give the explicit formula of its velocity.

Keywords: random walk; random environment; unbounded jumps; birth and death process; skeleton process; environment viewed from particle

MSC 2010: 60K37; 60J80

1 Introduction

Our prime concern is to prove the Law of Large Number (LLN hereafter) for Birth and Death Process in Random Environment (BDPRE hereafter) with bounded jumps , say $\{N_t\}_{t\geq 0}$. We assume that at each discontinuity, the particle jumps at most a distance R to the right or at most a distance L to the left. For the nearest neighbour setting $L = R = 1$, if one defines T_n the hitting time of n, then $N_{T_n} = n$ and $\{T_n - T_{n-1}\}_{n\geq 1}$ forms a stationary and mixing sequence under the annealed probability whenever the environment is i.i.d.. Therefore the LLN of $\{N_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ follows from that of $\{T_n\}_{n\geq 0}$. For details,

*Supported by National Nature Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11226199) and Nature Science Foundation of Anhui Educational Committee (Grant No. KJ2014A085)

see Ritter [20]. For bounded-jump setting, the above approach does not work. Similarly, define the ladder times $T_0 = 0$ and $T_n = \inf\{t > T_{n-1} : N_{T_n} > N_{T_{n-1}}\}$, $n \geq 1$. Two problems arise: (1) It is hard to tell the exact value of N_{T_n}, though we know that $n \leq N_{T_n} \leq nR$; (2) $\{T_n - T_{n-1}\}_{n\geq 1}$ is not a stationary sequence under the annealed probability even if the environment is i.i.d..

We turn to consider the h-skeleton process $\{N_{nh}\}_{n\geq 0}$, $h > 0$ of $\{N_t\}_{t\geq 0}$. If the LLN of the h-skeleton process is proved, then the LLN of $\{N_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ follows from some standard procedures. However, $\{N_{nh}\}_{n\geq 0}$ is indeed a discrete time *random walk in random environment with unbounded jumps,* since theoretically speaking, $\{N_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ may have many jumps in a time interval of length h.

Although the developments of Random Walk in Random Environment (RWRE hereafter) with bounded jumps were almost satisfying, RWRE with unbounded jumps was very seldom considered. Andjel [3] proved the 0-1 law. Comets and Popov [7] proved an LLN. In [7], two main conditions were required essentially: a) the jumping probabilities of the walk have an exponential tail; b) " the random walk is 'uniformly' transient to the right (i.e., there are no 'traps')". We mention also that in Gallesco and Popov [10, 11], the author studied the central limit theorem of random walks with unbounded jumps among random conductances.

The BDPRE with bounded jumps considered in this paper is the continuous time analogue of RWRE with bounded jumps. The situation of RWRE with bounded jumps on $\mathbb{Z}$ is almost satisfying. We review here only the known results closely related to the transient RWRE. For the nearest neighbour setting, the 0-1 law and the LLN with explicit velocity in the case of i.i.d. environment were studied in Solomon [22]; the extension to stationary and ergodic environment was given in Alili [1]. The RWRE with bounded jumps (jumps are non-nearest neighbor) was introduced in Key [15], where the middle Lyapunov exponents of a sequence of positive random matrices were used to give the recurrence criteria. Letchikov [18] simplified the recurrence criteria and proved a $\log^2 n$ law for the recurrent case as Sinai's walk. The regime where the LLN holds with a positive velocity was characterized in Brémont [5, 6] by "the environment viewed from particle", but no explicit formula is available any longer. In [12, 13, 14], the authors set up the branching structure for RWRE with bounded jumps and gave the explicit formulae for the velocities of LLNs. At last we point out that Bolthausen and Goldsheid [4] studied the recurrence and transience of RWRE on a strip, which is a generalization of RWRE with bounded jumps. The LLN for RWRE on a strip could be found in Roitershtein [21].

In this paper, firstly we prove an LLN for RWRE with unbounded jumps. In our setup, we only need to require that the jumping probabilities have an polynomial tail. Moreover we do not need the condition " the random walk is 'uniformly' transient to the right" used in [7]. Our approach is based on "the environment viewed from particle" which dates back to Kozlov [16]. But in Kozlov [16] and some later literatures, this approach is only used to treat the bounded-jump setting. We use the large deviation for martingales (with unbounded martingale differences) derived in Lesigne and Volný [17] to estimate the tail of a martingale related to RWRE with unbounded jumps. By constructing an invariant measure for the auxiliary Markov chain of the environment viewed from particle, we could show the LLN for the summation of the local drift of RWRE with unbounded jumps. In this way, we prove the LLN for RWRE with unbounded jumps. Secondly, using the LLN of RWRE with unbounded jumps, we prove the LLN of BDPRE with bounded jumps. We assume a uniform ellipticity condition on the environment, which is crucial for our development. Under such ellipticity condition, we could show that the tail probability of the jumps for the h-skeleton process is exponentially bounded. Therefore we could use the LLN for RWRE with unbounded jumps to get the LLN for the h-skeleton process. Then the LLN for BDPRE with bounded jumps follows by some standard procedures.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we define strictly the models and state the main results. The LLN for RWRE with unbounded jumps is proved in Section 3 while the LLNs for the h-skeleton process $\{N_{nh}\}_{n\geq 0}$ and $\{N_t\}$ are proved in Section 4. We devote Section 5 to give the explicit formula of the velocity $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$ for the case $L = R = 2$ by using the branching structure in the embedded process constructed in [13]. An appendix section is also given at the end of the paper to discuss the existence of the process $\{N_t\}$.

2 The models and results

2.1 RWRE with unbounded jumps

Let Ω be the collection of $\omega = (\omega_x)_{x\in\mathbb{Z}}$ where for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\omega_x = (\omega_{xy})_{y\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a probability measure on $\mathbb{Z}$, that is, $\omega_{xy} \geq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sum_{y\in\mathbb{Z}} \omega_{xy} = 1$. Let θ be the shift operator on Ω defined by $(\theta\omega)_x := \omega_{x+1}$. Equip Ω with Borel σ-algebra $\mathcal{F}$ and let $\mathbb{P}$ be a probability measure on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$. For a typical realization of ω, we consider a Markov chain $\{S_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ with transitional probabilities

$$P_\omega^{x_0}(S_{n+1} = x + y \big| S_n = x) = \omega_{xy} \text{ for all } n \geq 0,\ P_\omega^{x_0}(S_0 = x_0) = 1,$$

so that $P_\omega^{x_0}$ is the quenched law of the Markov chain starting from x_0 in the environment ω. Define a new probability measure P^{x_0} by

$$P^{x_0}(\cdot) = \int P_\omega^{x_0}(\cdot)\mathbb{P}(d\omega),$$

which is called the annealed probability. We use $E_\omega^{x_0}$, E^{x_0} and $\mathbb{E}$ to denote the expectation operator for $P_\omega^{x_0}$, P^{x_0} and $\mathbb{P}$ respectively. The superscript x_0 will be omitted whenever it is 0.

Condition B

(B1) $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \theta)$ forms a stationary and ergodic system.

(B2) There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(\omega_{01} > \varepsilon) = 1$.

(B3) There exist small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ and proper $D > 0$, such that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$\omega_{0j} < D|j|^{-(3+\varepsilon_0)}.$$

Define $T = \inf\{n > 0 : S_n > 0\}$, which is the time $\{S_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ hits $[1, \infty)$ and let

$$U_k = \#\{0 \leq n < T : S_n = k\}.$$

Here and throughout, "#{ }" denotes the number of elements in set { }. We have the following ballistic LLN for $\{S_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that condition B holds and $E(T) < \infty$. Then*

$$P\text{-a.s.}, \ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{S_n}{n} = v_{\mathbb{P}} > 0$$

where

$$v_{\mathbb{P}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\leq 0} E_{\theta^{-k}\omega}\big(U_k|S_{T=i}\big)\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} j\omega_{0j}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E\big(T|S_T = i\big)}.$$

Remark 1. (1) Our proof is based on an approach known as "the environment viewed from particle" introduced in Kozlov [16]. In [16] and the later literatures, this approach was only used to treat the bounded-jump setting. In our setup, we construct an invariant measure Q which is equivalent to $\mathbb{P}$. Under Q, $\overline{\omega}(n) := \theta^{S_n}\omega, \ n \geq 0$ form a stationary and ergodic sequence. Let $d(x, \omega) = E_\omega^x(S_1 - S_0)$ be the local drift and set

$$M_n = S_n - S_0 - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d(S_n, \omega).$$

$\{M_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a martingale with unbounded differences. But under (B3), we could use the large deviation for martingale to estimate the tail of M_n. Therefore, using the auxiliary Markov chain $\{\overline{\omega}(n)\}_{n\geq 0}$ we prove the LLN of $\{S_n\}_{n\geq 0}$.

(2) For RWRE with bounded jumps. The velocity of the LLN could be written in terms of the environment ω explicitly because one could calculate the quenched mean $E_\omega(T)$ by using the branching structure constructed from the path of the random walk. See [13] for details. However for unbounded-jump setting, we do not know how to calculate the quenched mean $E_\omega(T)$. Therefore, the condition "$E(T)<\infty$" looks not so satisfying and consequently the velocity could not be given explicitly. For some special case, we could give the explicit formula for the velocity $v_{\mathbb{P}}$. See the discussion below.

If $\mathbb{P}(\omega_{0j}=0, j\geq 2)=1$, define

$$\Phi=\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \omega_{0,1} & \omega_{0,0} & \omega_{0,-1} & \omega_{0,-2} & \omega_{0,-3} & \omega_{0,-4} & \cdots \\ 0 & \omega_{-1,1} & \omega_{-1,0} & \omega_{-1,-1} & \omega_{-1,-2} & \omega_{-1,-3} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_{-2,1} & \omega_{-2,0} & \omega_{-2,-1} & \omega_{-2,-2} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{-3,1} & \omega_{-3,0} & \omega_{-3,-1} & \cdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{-4,1} & \omega_{-4,0} & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\pi=(\pi_1,\pi_0,\pi_{-1},\pi_{-2},...)$ be a solution of the equation

$$\pi\Phi=\pi,$$

with $\pi_1=1$. If $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i\leq 0}\pi_i)<\infty$, then it follows from the classical ergodic theory for Markov chain that P-a.s., $T<\infty$ and $E_\omega(T)=\sum_{i\leq 0}\pi_i$. We have the following corollary of Theorem 1.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that condition B holds and* $\mathbb{E}(\sum_{i\leq 0}\pi_i)<\infty$. *Then*

$$P\text{-a.s., } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{S_n}{n}=\frac{1}{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i\leq 0}\pi_i\right)}.$$

2.2 BDPRE with bounded jumps

Next we define the birth and death process in random environment with bounded jumps. To construct the environment, fix $1\leq L,R\in\mathbb{Z}$ and let $\tilde{\Omega}$ be the collection of $\tilde{\omega}=(\tilde{\omega}_i)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}=(\mu_i^L,...,\mu_i^1,\lambda_i^1,...,\lambda_i^R)_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$, where $\mu_i^l,\lambda_i^r\geq 0$ for all $i\in\mathbb{Z}$, $l=1,..,L$ and $r=1,...,R$. Equip $\tilde{\Omega}$ with the Borel σ-algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}$

and let $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ be a probability measure on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$. Then the so-called random environment $\tilde{\omega}$ is a random element of $\tilde{\Omega}$ chosen according to $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$. Given a realization of $\tilde{\omega}$, let $\{N_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ be a continuous time Markov chain, which waits at a state n an exponentially distributed time with parameter $\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_n^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_n^r$ and then jumps to $n-i$ with probability $\mu_n^i/(\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_n^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_n^r)$, $i=1,...,L$ or to $n+j$ with probability $\lambda_n^j/(\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_n^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_n^r)$, $j=1,...,R$. In this paper, we always assume that the paths of $\{N_t\}$ are right continuous. We call the process $\{N_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ a *birth and death process in random environment with bounded jumps*.

For a typical realization of $\tilde{\omega}$, $\tilde{P}^x_{\tilde{\omega}}$ denotes the law induced by the process $\{N_t\}$ starting from x. The measure $\tilde{P}^x_{\tilde{\omega}}$ is usually related as the *quenched* probability. Define the annealed probability measure $\tilde{P}^x$ by $\tilde{P}^x(\cdot) = \int_{\Omega}\tilde{P}^x_{\tilde{\omega}}(\cdot)\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(d\tilde{\omega})$. The notations $\tilde{E}^x_{\tilde{\omega}}$, $\tilde{E}^x$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}$ will be used to denote the expectation operators for $\tilde{P}^x_{\tilde{\omega}}$, $\tilde{P}^x$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ respectively. The superscript x will be omitted if it is 0. Let operator θ be the canonical shift on $\tilde{\Omega}$ defined by $(\theta\tilde{\omega})_i = \tilde{\omega}_{i+1}$.

Condition C

(C1) $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}, \tilde{\mathbb{P}}, \theta)$ forms a stationary and ergodic system.

(C2) the measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$ is uniformly elliptic, that is,

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\varepsilon < \mu_0^l, \lambda_0^r < M, 1\leq l\leq L, 1\leq r\leq R\Big) = 1$$

for some small $\varepsilon > 0$ and large $M > 0$.

Under condition (C2), the process $\{N_t\}$ exists for $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.a. $\tilde{\omega}$. For details, see the appendix section below.

Given $\tilde{\omega}$, define for $i\in\mathbb{Z}$,

$$b_i(k) = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{j=R-k+1}^{R}\lambda_i^j}{\mu_i^L} & \text{if } 1\leq k\leq R, \\ -\frac{\sum_{j=k-R}^{L}\mu_i^j}{\mu_i^L} & \text{if } R+1\leq k\leq R+L-1, \end{cases}$$

and let

$$A_i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ b_i(1) & b_i(2) & \cdots & b_i(L+R-1) \end{pmatrix}$$

be an $(L+R-1)\times(L+R-1)$ matrix.

Since A_i depends only on $\tilde{\omega}_i$, $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is an ergodic sequence of random matrices under $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$. Moreover, under condition (C2), $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}|\ln\|A_0^{-1}\||+\tilde{\mathbb{E}}|\ln\|A_0\|| <$

∞. Hence one could use Oseledec's multiplicative ergodic theorem (see [19]) to the sequence $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$. Consequently, we get the Lyapunov exponents of the sequence $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ which we write in increasing order as

$$-\infty < \gamma_1 \le \gamma_2 \le ... \le \gamma_{R+L-1} < \infty.$$

Proposition 1 (Recurrence/transience criteria)**.** *Suppose that condition C holds. Let $\gamma_1 \le \gamma_2 \le ... \le \gamma_{R+L-1}$ be the Lyapunov exponents of the sequence $\{A_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ under the probability measure $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$. Then*
(1) $\gamma_R > 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{P}(\lim_{t\to\infty} N_t = \infty) = 1$;
(2) $\gamma_R = 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{P}(-\infty = \liminf_{t\to\infty} N_t < \limsup_{t\to\infty} N_t = \infty) = 1$;
(3) $\gamma_R < 0 \Rightarrow \tilde{P}(\lim_{t\to\infty} N_t = -\infty) = 1$.

Proof. Since the recurrence criteria for $\{N_t\}$ is the same as the embedded process $\{\chi_n\}$ defined below. Proposition 1 is just a corollary of Theorem A in Letchikov [18]. □

Let $\tau_0 = 0$, and for $n \ge 1$ define $\tau_n = \inf\{t > \tau_{n-1} : N_t \ne N_{\tau_{n-1}}\}$. Since the process $\{N_t\}$ exists, $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\tau_n < \infty$ for all n. Note that $\tau_n,\ n \ge 0$ are the consecutive discontinuities of $\{N_t\}$. Let $\chi_n = N_{\tau_n},\ n \ge 0$. Then $\{\chi_n\}$ is called the *embedded process* of $\{N_t\}$. Next we study the LLN of $\{N_t\}$. Let $T_0 = 0$ and for $n \ge 1$, define recursively

$$T_n = \inf\{t > T_{n-1} : N_t > N_{T_{n-1}}\}.$$

We call $T_n,\ n \ge 0$ the ladder times of the process $\{N_t\}$. Define

$$v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} = \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\Big(\sum_{r=1}^{R}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}\big(\sum_{j=1}^{U_k}\xi_{kj}|N_{T_1}=r\big)\big(\sum_{l=1}^{L}(-l)\mu_0^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R} r\lambda_0^r\big)\Big)}{\sum_{r=1}^{R}\tilde{E}(T_1|N_{T_1}=r)} \tag{1}$$

where

$$U_k := \#\{n : N_{\tau_n} = k, \tau_n < T_1\}$$

is the number of times the embedded process $\{\chi_n\}$ has ever visited k before it hits $[1,\infty)$, and given $\tilde{\omega}$, $\xi_{kj},\ k \le 0,\ j \ge 0$ are independent random variables which are also all independent of U_k such that $\tilde{P}_\omega(\xi_{kj} > t) = e^{-(\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_k^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_k^r)t},\ t \ge 0$.

Theorem 2 (LLN of $\{N_t\}$)**.** *Suppose that Condition C holds and $\gamma_R \ge 0$. Then*
(a) $\tilde{E}T_1 < \infty \Rightarrow \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{N_t}{t} = v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} > 0$, $\tilde{P}$*-a.s.;*
(b) $\tilde{E}T_1 = \infty \Rightarrow \lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{N_t}{t} = 0$, $\tilde{P}$*-a.s..*

Remark 2. (i) $\tilde{E}T_1$ and the velocity $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$ of LLN is not given directly in terms of $\tilde{\omega}$. They could be calculated by using the branching structure constructed in [13]. Therefore the formulae of both of $\tilde{E}T_1$ and $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$ could be given explicitly. We treat the case $L = R = 2$ to explain the idea in Section 5. See Theorem 4 below. The special case $R = 1, L > 1$ is discussed in Wang [24].
(ii). The case $\gamma_R \le 0$ could be treated in a similar way. We omit this part in this paper.
(iii). In the proof of part (a) of Theorem 2, we only use the condition "**(C2')** for some small $\kappa > 0$ and large $K > 0$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\lambda_0^1 > \kappa, \sum_{l=1}^{L} \mu_0^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R} \lambda_0^r < K) = 1$." Under condition (C2'), $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}(\lambda_0^r, \mu_0^l = 0$ for certain $1 \le r \le R, 1 \le l \le L) > 0$ is permitted. So (C2') is weaker than (C2). When proving part (b) of Theorem 2 we borrow some results from [5] where the uniform ellipticity in (C2) is used.

To prove Theorem 2, we need to prove the LLN of the h-skeleton process of $\{N_t\}$. Fix a number $h > 0$, which will be assumed to be small enough. For $n \ge 0$, define $X_n = N_{nh}$. Then $\{X_n\}$ is a discrete time RWRE with unbounded jumps, which is called the *h-skeleton process* of $\{N_t\}_{n\ge 0}$. For $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ let

$$p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h, i, j) := \tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_h = i + j | N_0 = i)$$

be the transition probabilities of $\{X_n\}$. Define $T_1^h = \inf\{k : X_k > 0\}$, and let

$$U_k^h = \#\{0 \le n < T_1^h : X_n = k\}.$$

Theorem 3 (LLN of skeleton process)**.** *Suppose that condition C holds. Then $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\{X_n\}$ is transient to the right, recurrent or transient to the left according as $\gamma_R \ge 0$, $\gamma_R = 0$ or $\gamma_R \le 0$. Moreover, if $\gamma_R \ge 0$, then*
$\tilde{E}T_1^h = \infty \Rightarrow \tilde{P}$*-a.s.,* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{X_n}{n} = 0$;
$\tilde{E}T_1^h < \infty \Rightarrow \tilde{P}$*-a.s.,* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{X_n}{n} = v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}^h > 0$,
where $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}^h = \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k\le 0} \tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}\big(U_k^h | X_{T_1^h = i}\big) \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} j p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,0,j)\Big)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \tilde{E}\big(T_1^h | X_{T_1^h = i}\big)}$.

Remark 3. (i) The h-skeleton process $\{X_n\}$ is an RWRE with *unbounded jumps*. Under (C2), we could show that, for some proper constants $c_0, c_1 > 0$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s.,

$$p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h, i, j) < e^{c_0 h} e^{-c_1|j|}.$$

Hence, the positive regime of the LLN in Theorem 3 follows from Theorem 1.
(ii) One sees easily from Theorem 2 that $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}^h$ is indeed independent of h and $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}^h = v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$. For details, see the proof of Theorem 2 below.

3 LLN for RWRE -Proof of Theorem 1

For $n \geq 0$, define $\overline{\omega}(n) = \theta^{S_n}\omega$. $\{\overline{\omega}(n)\}_{n\geq 0}$ is an $\Omega^{\mathbb{N}}$-valued process. It is usually called "the environment viewed from particle". Let

$$K(\omega, d\omega') = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \omega_{0j}\delta_{\omega'=\theta^j\omega}.$$

Lemma 1. *Under either P or P_ω, $\{\overline{\omega}(n)\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a Markov chain with transition kernel $K(\omega, \omega')$.*

Proof. For test functions $f_1, ..., f_n, f_{n+1}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} E_\omega\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{n+1} f_k(\overline{\omega}(k))\Big) &= E_\omega\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{n} f_k(\overline{\omega}(k)) E_\omega^{S_n} f_{n+1}(\theta^{S_1}\omega)\Big) \\ &= E_\omega\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{n} f_k(\overline{\omega}(k)) \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \omega_{S_n j} f_{n+1}(\theta^{S_n+j}\omega)\Big) \\ &= E_\omega\Big(\prod_{k=1}^{n} f_k(\overline{\omega}(k)) \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} K f_{n+1}(\overline{\omega}(n))\Big). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\{\overline{\omega}(n)\}_{n\geq 0}$ is a Markov chain under P_ω. Taking expectation, the above equations also yield the Markov property of $\{\overline{\omega}(n)\}_{n\geq 0}$ under P. □

Whenever $E(T) < \infty$, define the measures

$$Q(d\omega) := E\left(\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{S_T=i}}{P_\omega(S_T = i)} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} 1_{\overline{\omega}(k)\in d\omega}\right),\ \overline{Q}(d\omega) = \frac{Q(d\omega)}{E(T)}.$$

Lemma 2. *Suppose that Condition C holds and $E(T) < \infty$. Then Q is invariant under the kernel K, that is*

$$Q(B) = \iint \mathbf{1}_{\omega'\in B} K(\omega, d\omega') Q(d\omega).$$

Moreover, $Q \sim \mathbb{P}$ and

$$\frac{dQ}{d\mathbb{P}} = \sum_{k\leq 0}\sum_{i\geq 1} E_{\theta^{-k}\omega}(U_k | S_T = i) =: \pi(\omega),$$

where $U_k = \#\{n \leq T : S_n = k\}$.

Proof. By the definition of Q, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\iint \mathbf{1}_{\omega'\in B} K(\omega, d\omega') Q(d\omega) &= \int P_\omega(\theta^{S_1}\omega \in B) Q(d\omega) \\
&= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{S_T=i}}{P_\omega(S_T=i)} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} P_{\overline{\omega}(k)}(\theta^{S_1}\overline{\omega}(k) \in B) \Big) \\
&= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{S_T=i}}{P_\omega(S_T=i)} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} P_{\overline{\omega}(k)}(\overline{\omega}(k+1) \in B) \Big) \\
&= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \sum_{k\geq 0} P_\omega\left(T \geq k+1, \overline{\omega}(k+1) \in B \big| S_T = i\right) \Big) \\
&= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \sum_{k\geq 1} P_\omega\left(T > k, \overline{\omega}(k) \in B \big| S_T = i\right) \Big) \\
&\qquad + E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} P_\omega\left(T < \infty, \theta^i\omega \in B \big| S_T = i\right) \Big).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $E(T) < \infty$, then $P(T < \infty) = P(T > 0) = 1$. This fact together with the stationarity implies that the right-most hand of the last equations equals to

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \sum_{k\geq 1} P_\omega\left(T > k, \overline{\omega}(k) \in B \big| S_T = i\right) \Big) \\
&\qquad + E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} P_\omega\left(T > 0, \overline{\omega}(0) \in B \big| S_T = i\right) \Big) \\
&= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 0} \sum_{k\geq 0} P_\omega\left(T > k, \overline{\omega}(k) \in B \big| S_T = i\right) \Big) = Q(B).
\end{aligned}$$

The first part of the lemma follows. To prove the second part, for testing function $f(\omega)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int f dQ &= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{S_T=i}}{P_\omega(S_T=i)} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} f(\overline{\omega}(k)) \Big) \\
&= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{S_T=i}}{P_\omega(S_T=i)} \sum_{k=0}^{T-1} f(\theta^{S_k}\omega) \Big) \\
&= E\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{S_T=i}}{P_\omega(S_T=i)} \sum_{k\leq 0} U_k f(\theta^k\omega) \Big)
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} E_\omega \Big(\sum_{k\leq 0} U_k f(\theta^k \omega) \big| S_T = i \Big) \Big)$$
$$= \mathbb{E}\Big(f(\omega) \sum_{i\geq 1} \sum_{k\leq 0} E_{\theta^{-k}\omega} \Big(U_k \big| S_T = i \Big) \Big). \tag{2}$$

By stationarity, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\sum_{i\geq 1} \sum_{k\leq 0} E_{\theta^{-k}\omega} \Big(U_k \big| S_T = i \Big) \Big) = \sum_{i\geq 1} \sum_{k\leq 0} E\Big(U_k \big| S_T = i \Big) \leq E(T) < \infty.$$

Then it follows from (2) that $Q \sim \mathbb{P}$ and

$$\frac{dQ}{d\mathbb{P}} = \sum_{k\leq 0} \sum_{i\geq 1} E_{\theta^{-k}\omega}(U_k | S_T = i).$$

□

Lemma 3. *Under the conditions of Lemma 2,* $\{\overline{\omega}(n)\}$ *is stationary and ergodic under the probability measure* $\overline{Q} \times P_\omega$.

With Lemma 2 in hand, Lemma 3 follows similarly as Sznitman [23], Theorem 1.2 or Zeitouni [25], Corollary 2.1.25.

Define the local drift $d(x, \omega) = E^x_\omega(S_1 - S_0)$ and set

$$M_n = S_n - S_0 - \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d(S_n, \omega).$$

Lemma 4. *Under* P_ω, $\{M_n\}$ *is a martingale and* P*-a.s.,* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{M_n}{n} = 0$.

Proof. Note that

$$E_\omega(M_n - M_{n-1} | M_{n-1}, ..., M_0)$$
$$= E_\omega(S_n - S_{n-1} - d(S_{n-1}, \omega) | S_{n-1}, ..., S_0) = 0.$$

Then $\{M_n\}$ is a martingale under P_ω. By (B3), there exist some constants $c_2 > 0$ and $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon_0$ such that $E_\omega(|M_n - M_{n-1}|^{2+\varepsilon_1}) < c_2$. Then one follows from Theorem 3.2 in [17] that there exists constant $c_3 > 0$ such that for $\lambda > 0$, and n large enough,

$$P(|M_n| > \sqrt{n}\lambda) \leq \frac{c_3}{\lambda^{2+\varepsilon_1}}. \tag{3}$$

Choosing $0 < \varepsilon_2 < \frac{1}{2}$ properly, we have $(2+\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_2 > 1$. Setting $\lambda = n^{\varepsilon_2}$ in (3), it follows that

$$P(|M_n| > n^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon_2}) \le c_3 n^{-(2+\varepsilon_1)\varepsilon_2}.$$

An application of Borel-Cantelli's lemma yields that

$$P\text{-a.s.}, \ \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{M_n}{n} = 0.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1: By Lemma 3, $\{\overline{\omega}(n)\}$ is a stationary and ergodic sequence under the measure $\overline{Q} \times P_\omega$. Using Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, we have that for $\overline{Q}$-a.a. or $\mathbb{P}$-a.a. ω, P_ω-a.s.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d(S_k, \omega) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} d(0, \overline{\omega}(k)) = \int d(0,\omega) d\overline{Q}. \tag{4}$$

We conclude from Lemma 4 and (4) that P-a.s.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{S_n}{n} = \int d(0,\omega) d\overline{Q} =: v_{\mathbb{P}}.$$

It follows from Lemma 2 that

$$v_{\mathbb{P}} = \int d(0,\omega) d\overline{Q} = \frac{\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k\le 0} E_{\theta^{-k}\omega}(U_k | S_{T=i}) \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} j\omega_{0j}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} E(T|S_T = i)}.$$

Theorem 1 is proved. □

4 LLN for BDPRE with bounded jumps

4.1 LLN for the h-skeleton process-Proof of Theorem 3

The recurrence criteria for $\{X_n\}$ in Theorem 3 follows directly from Proposition 1. The zero speed regime of the LLN for $\{X_n\}$ follows from the counterpart of Theorem 2. Next we prove the non-zero speed regime of the LLN in Theorem 3. To begin with, we estimate the tail probability of the transition probability $p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,i,j) := \tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_h = i+j | N_0 = i)$ of $\{X_n\}$. The following lemma shows that for fixed $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s., $p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,i,j)$ decays exponentially to 0 as $|j| \to \infty$.

Lemma 5. *Suppose that Condition (C2) is satisfied. Then for $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.a. $\tilde{\omega}$, there exist $0 < c_0 < \infty$ and $0 < c_1 < \infty$, which are independent of h and $\tilde{\omega}$, such that for $|j| > \max\{L, R\}$,*

$$p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h, i, j) < e^{c_0 h} e^{-c_1 |j|}, \tag{5}$$

where c_1 could be made arbitrarily large by adjusting the value of c_0.

Proof. We prove only the case $j > \max\{L, R\}$. The case $j < -\max\{L, R\}$ follows similarly. Let $m = [\frac{j}{R}]$. Since at each discontinuity, the process $\{N_t\}$ jumps at most a distance R to the right, then starting from i, in order to reach $i + j$, $\{N_t\}$ has at least m discontinuities in a time period of length h. Let $\eta_k,\ k = 1, ..., m$ be these discontinuities and τ_k be the waiting time after η_k until the process $\{N_t\}$ leaves N_{η_k}. Then we have that

$$p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h, i, j) = \tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_h = i + j | N_0 = i) \leq \tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tau_1 + ... + \tau_m \leq h). \tag{6}$$

Note that $\tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tau_k > t | N_{\eta_k} = i_k) = e^{-s_k t}$ for $t > 0$ where $s_k = \big(\sum_{l=1}^{L} \mu^l_{i_k} + \sum_{r=1}^{R} \lambda^r_{i_k}\big)$. Moreover under $\tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}$, $\tau_k,\ k = 1, ..., m$ are mutually independent. Then by Chebycheff's bound, it follows that for $\lambda < 0$, $K = (L + R)M$, $\kappa = (L + R)\varepsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tau_1 + ... + \tau_m \leq h) \\
&= \sum_{i_1,...,i_k} \tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}\Big(\sum_{k=1}^{m} \tau_k \leq h \Big| N_{\eta_k} = i_k, 1 \leq k \leq m\Big) \tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_{\eta_k} = i_k, 1 \leq k \leq m) \\
&\leq \sum_{i_1,...,i_k} e^{-\lambda h} \tilde{E}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}\Big(e^{\lambda \sum_{k=1}^{m} \tau_k} \Big| N_{\eta_k} = i_k, 1 \leq k \leq m\Big) \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_{\eta_k} = i_k, 1 \leq k \leq m) \\
&= e^{-\lambda h} \sum_{i_1,...,i_k} \prod_{k=1}^{m} \frac{s_k}{s_k - \lambda} \tilde{P}^i_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_{\eta_k} = i_k, 1 \leq k \leq m) \\
&\leq e^{-\lambda h} \Big(\frac{K}{\kappa - \lambda}\Big)^m,\ \tilde{\mathbb{P}}\text{-a.s.},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from condition (C2). Substituting the above estimation to (6), we have that $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.,

$$p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h, i, j) \leq e^{-\lambda h} \Big(\frac{K}{\kappa - \lambda}\Big)^m \leq e^{-\lambda h} e^{\frac{j}{R}(\log K - \log(\kappa - \lambda))}.$$

By choosing $\overline{\lambda} < 0$ properly and letting $c_0 = -\overline{\lambda}$, $c_1 = (\log(\kappa - \overline{\lambda}) - \log K)/R$, (5) is proved. Of course, we could make c_1 arbitrarily large by adjusting the value of $\overline{\lambda}$. □

Lemma 6. *Under the measure* $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$, $\{p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,i,j)\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$ *is a stationary and ergodic sequence.*

For the proof of the lemma, refer to Durrett [9]. □

One follows from condition (C2) that for some small constant $c_4 > 0$

$$p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,0,1) \geq c_4. \tag{7}$$

Taking Lemma 5, Lemma 6 and (7) together, we could use Theorem 1 to conclude that

$$\tilde{E}(T_1^h) < \infty \Rightarrow \tilde{P}\text{-a.s.}, \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{X_n}{n} = v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}^h.$$

We complete the proof of Theorem 3. □

4.2 The LLN of $\{N_t\}$-Proof of Theorem 2

In this subsection, using the LLN (nonzero speed regime) of the h-skeleton process proved in Subsection 4.1, we prove the LLN of the process $\{N_t\}$. Firstly, we show that for h small enough, $\tilde{E}(T_1^h) < \infty$ whenever $\tilde{E}(T_1) < \infty$. Therefore, under the condition of part (a) of Theorem 2, the condition of the nonzero speed regime of LLN in Theorem 3 is also satisfied for h small enough.

Lemma 7. *Fix* $s > 1$. *Suppose that condition (C2) holds. Then, for* n *large enough,* $\tilde{P}$*-a.s.,* $T_1^{\frac{1}{n^s}} \frac{1}{n^s} \leq T_1 + \frac{1}{n^s}$. *Consequently, we have that for* n *large, if* $\tilde{E}(T_1) < \infty$, *then* $\tilde{E}\Big(T_1^{\frac{1}{n^s}}\Big) < \infty$ *and* $\tilde{P}$*-a.s.,* $\lim_{n\to\infty} T_1^{\frac{1}{n^s}} \frac{1}{n^s} = T_1$.

Proof. Given $\tilde{\omega}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}\Big(T_1^{\frac{1}{n^s}} \frac{1}{n^s} > T_1 + \frac{1}{n^s}\Big) \\
&\quad \leq \tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}\Big(\{N_t\} \text{ has at least one jump in } [T_1, T_1 + \frac{1}{n^s})\Big) \\
&\quad \leq \tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}\Big(\{N_t\} \text{ leaves } N_{T_1} \text{ within time } \frac{1}{n^s}\Big) \\
&\quad = \sum_{r=1}^{R} \tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_{T_1} = r)\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}\Big(\nu_r < \frac{1}{n^s} \big| N_{T_1} = r\Big)
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where ν_r is the waiting time at state r until the next jump of $\{N_t\}$ happens. Since ν_r is exponentially distributed with parameter $\zeta_r := \sum_{l=1}^{L} \mu_r^l + \sum_{k=1}^{R} \lambda_r^k$.

Using condition (C2), with $K = (L+R)M$, it follows that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s., the right-most hand of (8) equals to

$$\sum_{r=1}^{R} \tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}(N_{T_1} = r)(1 - e^{-\zeta_r \frac{1}{n^s}}) \leq 1 - e^{-K\frac{1}{n^s}}.$$

Noting that $s > 1$, then we have that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{P}\Big(T_1^{\frac{1}{n^s}} \frac{1}{n^s} > T_1 + \frac{1}{n^s}\Big) < \infty.$$

An application of Borel Cantelli's lemma yields that for n large, $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$T_1^{\frac{1}{n^s}} \frac{1}{n^s} \leq T_1 + \frac{1}{n^s}. \tag{9}$$

Since $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $T_1^h h > T_1$, then one follows from (9) that $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\lim_{n\to\infty} T_1^{\frac{1}{n^s}} \frac{1}{n^s} = T_1$. □

Proof of Theorem 2: We prove part (a) first. Suppose $\gamma_R \geq 0$ and $\tilde{E}(T_1) < \infty$. Fix $h > 0$ small enough. For any $t > 0$, there is a unique number n_t such that $n_t h \leq t < (n_t+1)h$. Let J_t be the number of jumps of $\{N_t\}$ in the time interval $[n_t h, (n_t + 1)h)$. Then, under condition (C2), a similar argument as the proof of Lemma 5 yields that there exist some positive constants c_5 and c_6 such that

$$\tilde{P}(J_t > n) \leq e^{c_5 h} e^{-nc_6}. \tag{10}$$

Note that the bound in (10) is independent of t. Applying Borel-Cantelli lemma, we have that $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{J_t}{n} = 0 \tag{11}$$

uniformly in t. Since at each discontinuity, $\{N_t\}$ jumps at most a distance L to the left or at most a distance R to the right, we have that

$$\frac{N_{n_t h} - J_t L}{(n_t + 1)h} \leq \frac{N_t}{t} \leq \frac{N_{n_t h} + J_t R}{n_t h}. \tag{12}$$

For h small enough, by Lemma 7, $\tilde{E}(T_1^h) < \infty$. Then we have from the nonzero speed regime of LLN in Theorem 3, (11) and (12) that $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{N_t}{t} = \frac{v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}^h}{h}. \tag{13}$$

To finish the proof of part (a) in Theorem 2, it suffices to show that, for all $h > 0$,

$$\frac{v^h_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}}{h} = v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}. \tag{14}$$

Indeed, since $\frac{N_t}{t}$ is independent of h and the limit in (13) exists, then $\frac{v^h_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}}{h}$ is independent of h. Therefore we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v^h_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}}{h} = \lim_{h\to 0}\frac{v^h_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}}{h} &= \lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}(U^h_k|X_{T^h_1=i})\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} j p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,0,j)\right)}{h\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\tilde{E}(T^h_1|X_{T^h_1}=i)} \\ &= \lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}(hU^h_k|N_{hT^h_1=i})\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} j\frac{p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,0,j)}{h}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\tilde{E}(hT^h_1|N_{hT^h_1}=i)}. \end{aligned}\tag{15}$$

Note that by Lemma 5, under condition (C2), $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} j\frac{p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,0,j)}{h}$ is uniformly bounded from above. Moreover, by Lemma 7, $\tilde{P}$-a.s., hT^h_1 is bounded by $T_1 + h$ for h small, and by stationarity

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}(hU^h_k|N_{hT^h_1=i})\Big) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}(hU^h_k|N_{hT^h_1=i})\right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}\left(hU^h_k|N_{hT^h_1=i}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\tilde{E}\left(hT^h_1|N_{hT^h_1=i}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\lim_{h\to\infty 0} hT^h_1 = T_1$, then by the above discussion, the condition of dominated convergence theorem is satisfied. Note also that $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$\lim_{h\to 0} hU^h_k = \lim_{h\to 0}\sum_{j=0}^{T^h_1-1} h\mathbf{1}_{N_{jh}=k} = \int_0^{T_1}\mathbf{1}_{N_t=k}dt \overset{\mathcal{D}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^{U_k}\xi_{ki}, \tag{16}$$

where "$A \overset{\mathcal{D}}{=} B$" means that A equals to B in $\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}$ distribution. Since $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\lim_{h\to 0} hT^h_1 = T_1$, $hT^h_1 \ge T_1$, and the paths of $\{N_t\}$ are right continuous, then by dominated convergence, it follows from (15) and (16) that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{v^h_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}}{h} &= \lim_{h\to 0}\frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}(hU^h_k|N_{hT^h_1=i})\sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} j\frac{p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,0,j)}{h}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\tilde{E}(hT^h_1|N_{hT^h_1}=i)} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\Big(\sum_{r=1}^{R}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}\big(\sum_{j=1}^{U_k}\xi_{kj}|N_{T_1}=r\big)\big(\sum_{l=1}^{L}(-l)\mu_0^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R} r\lambda_0^r\big)\Big)}{\sum_{r=1}^{R}\tilde{E}(T_1|N_{T_1}=r)}\end{aligned}$$

$$= \quad v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} > 0,$$

where in the second equality, we use the facts $\tilde{P}(N_{T_1} = r) = 0$ for $r > R$ and

$$\lim_{h\to 0} \frac{p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h, 0, j)}{h} = \begin{cases} \lambda_0^j & \text{if } j = 1, ..., R, \\ \mu_0^j & \text{if } j = 1, ..., L, \\ 0 & \text{if } j < -L \text{ and } j > R. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, (14) is proved and part (a) of Theorem 2 follows.

Next, we turn to prove part (b) of Theorem 2. Suppose $\gamma_R \geq 0$ and $\tilde{E}(T_1) = \infty$. Recall that $\tau_n,\ n \geq 0$ are the consecutive discontinuities of $\{N_t\}$ and $\{\chi_n\} = \{N_{\tau_n}\}$ is the embedded process. Let $\overline{T}_1 := \inf\{k : \chi_k > 0\}$. As the first step, we show that

$$\tilde{E}(\overline{T}_1) = \infty. \tag{17}$$

For this purpose, for $k \leq 0$ let $\overline{U}_k = \#\{n < \overline{T}_1 : \chi_n = k\}$. Then Wald's equation implies that,

$$\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(T_1) = \sum_{k\leq 0} \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{\overline{U}_k} \xi_{ki}\Big) = \sum_{k\leq 0} \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\overline{U}_k)\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\xi_{k1}).$$

But condition (C2) implies that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s.,

$$\frac{1}{K} < \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\xi_{k1}) = \frac{1}{\sum_{l=1}^{L} \mu_k^l + \sum_{r=1}^{R} \lambda_k^r} < \frac{1}{\kappa}$$

with $K = (L + R)M$ and $\kappa = (L + R)\varepsilon$. Then it follows that $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.s.,

$$\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k\leq 0} \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\overline{U}_k) \leq \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(T_1) \leq \frac{1}{\kappa} \sum_{k\leq 0} \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\overline{U}_k).$$

Taking expectation, we have that

$$\frac{\tilde{E}(\overline{T}_1)}{K} \leq \tilde{E}(T_1) \leq \frac{\tilde{E}(\overline{T}_1)}{\kappa}.$$

Therefore (17) follows. Then it follows from Brémont [5] (See, Proposition 9.1, Theorem 9.2 and Corollary 9.3 therein.) that $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\chi_n}{n} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{N_{\tau_n}}{n} = 0. \tag{18}$$

As the second step, we show that for $h > 0$ small enough and n large enough

$$\tilde{P}\text{-a.s.}, \frac{\tau_n}{n} > h. \tag{19}$$

For $k \geq 1$, let $\nu_k = \tau_k - \tau_{k-1}$. Then under $\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}$, $\nu_k,\ k \geq 1$ are mutually independent and all exponentially distributed. By Chebycheff's bound, it follows that for $\lambda < 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tau_n \leq nh) &\leq e^{-\lambda nh}\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(e^{\lambda\sum_{k=1}^n \nu_k}) = e^{-\lambda nh}\prod_{k=1}^n \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(e^{\lambda\nu_k}) \\ &\leq e^{-n(\lambda h - \log K + \log(\kappa-\lambda))}\end{aligned}$$

with $\kappa = (L+R)\varepsilon$ and $K = (L+R)M$. Choosing properly $\overline{\lambda} < 0$ and h small enough, we could make $c(h) := \overline{\lambda}h - \log K + \log(\kappa - \overline{\lambda})$ a strictly positive number. Consequently we have $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\tau_n \leq nh) < \infty$. By applying Borel-Cantelli lemma, we have (19).

Finally, (18) and (19) imply that $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{N_{\tau_n}}{\tau_n} = 0. \tag{20}$$

For $t > 0$, there is a unique random number n_t such that $\tau_{n_t} \leq t < \tau_{n_t+1}$. Since at each discontinuity, $\{N_t\}$ jumps at most a distance L to the left or at most a distance R to the right, we have

$$\frac{N_{\tau_{n_t}} - L}{\tau_{n_t+1}} \leq \frac{N_t}{t} \leq \frac{N_{\tau_{n_t}} + R}{\tau_{n_t}} \tag{21}$$

It follows from (20) and (21) that $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}\frac{N_t}{t} = 0.$$

Part (b) of Theorem 2 is proved. □

5 Discussion of the velocity $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$

In this section, we let $R = L = 2$ and discuss the asymptotic velocity $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$. We have

Theorem 4. *Let $\pi(\tilde{\omega})$ and $D(\tilde{\omega})$ be as in (25) and (26) below. Suppose $L = R = 2$ and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\pi(\tilde{\omega})) < \infty$. Then $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{N_t}{t} = \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\pi(\tilde{\omega})(2\lambda_0^2 + \lambda_0^1 - \mu_0^1 - 2\mu_0^2)\right)}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(D(\tilde{\omega}))}.$$

Proof. Theorem 4 is just a special case of Theorem 2. We need only to calculate $v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}}$. Recall that $\overline{T}_1 = \inf\{n \geq 0 : \chi_n > 0\}$ is the first ladder time of the embedded process. Define

$$\overline{U}_k = \#\{n \leq \overline{T}_1 : \chi_n = k\}$$

which is the occupation time at state k of the embedded process before $\overline{T}_1$. In [13], the authors show that $\overline{U}_k$ could be written as the functional of a multitype branching process $\{Z_n\}_{n\leq 1}$ whose offspring matrices are the function of the environment $\tilde{\omega}$. To introduce those results, we need to introduce some notations.

Fix $a < b$. Let $\partial^+[a,b] = \{b, b+1\}$ and $\partial^-[a,b] = \{a, a-1\}$ be the positive and negative boundaries of $[a,b]$ correspondingly. For $k \in (a,b)$, $\zeta \in \partial^+[a,b] \cup \partial^-[a,b]$, define

$$\mathcal{P}_k(a,b,\zeta) = \tilde{P}^k_{\tilde{\omega}}(\{\chi_n\} \text{ exits the interval } [a+1, b-1] \text{ at } \zeta).$$

For $j = 1, 2$ let $p_i^j = \frac{\lambda_i^j}{\mu_i^1+\mu_i^2+\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}$ and $q_i^j = \frac{\mu_i^j}{\mu_i^1+\mu_i^2+\lambda_i^1+\lambda_i^2}$.

Writing $\mathcal{P}_k(a,b,\zeta)$ as $\mathcal{P}_k(\zeta)$ temporarily, one follows from Markov property that

$$\mathcal{P}_k(\zeta) = p_k^2\mathcal{P}_{k+2}(\zeta) + p_k^1\mathcal{P}_{k+1}(\zeta) + q_k^1\mathcal{P}_{k-1}(\zeta) + q_k^2\mathcal{P}_{k-2}(\zeta),$$

which leads to the following matrix form

$$V_k(\zeta) = M_k V_{k+1}(\zeta)$$

where

$$V_k(\zeta) := \begin{pmatrix} (\mathcal{P}_{k-1} - \mathcal{P}_{k-2})(\zeta) \\ (\mathcal{P}_k - \mathcal{P}_{k-1})(\zeta) \\ (\mathcal{P}_{k+1} - \mathcal{P}_k)(\zeta) \end{pmatrix}, M_k = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\mu_k^1+\mu_k^2}{\mu_k^2} & \frac{\lambda_k^1+\lambda_k^2}{\mu_k^2} & \frac{\lambda_k^2}{\mu_k^2} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $\mathcal{P}_k(a,b,b)$ and $\mathcal{P}_k(a,b,b+1)$ follow from some standard procedure. They could be expressed in terms of $\{M_i\}_{i\in\mathbb{Z}}$. For $k \leq i$, let

$$f_k(i,i+1) = \mathcal{P}_k(-\infty, i+1, i+1) \text{ and } f_k(i,i+2) = \mathcal{P}_k(-\infty, i+1, i+2).$$

For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$\alpha_{i,1} = \frac{q_i^1 p_{i-1}^1}{1 - q_{i-1}^1 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) - q_{i-1}^2 f_{i-3}(i-2, i-1)},$$
$$\alpha_{i,3} = \frac{q_i^1 p_{i-1}^2}{1 - q_{i-1}^1 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) - q_{i-1}^2 f_{i-3}(i-2, i-1)},$$
$$\beta_{i,1} = \frac{q_i^2 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) p_{i-1}^1}{1 - q_{i-1}^1 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) - q_{i-1}^2 f_{i-3}(i-2, i-1)},$$
$$\beta_{i,3} = \frac{q_i^2 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) p_{i-1}^2}{1 - q_{i-1}^1 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) - q_{i-1}^2 f_{i-3}(i-2, i-1)},$$
$$\gamma_{i,1} = \frac{q_{i+1}^2 p_{i-1}^1}{1 - q_{i-1}^1 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) - q_{i-1}^2 f_{i-3}(i-2, i-1)},$$
$$\gamma_{i,3} = \frac{q_{i+1}^2 p_{i-1}^2}{1 - q_{i-1}^1 f_{i-2}(i-2, i-1) - q_{i-1}^2 f_{i-3}(i-2, i-1)},$$
$$\alpha_{i,2} := q_i^1 - \alpha_{i,1} - \alpha_{i,3};\ \beta_{i,2} := q_i^2 - \beta_{i,1} - \beta_{i,3};\ \gamma_{i,2} := q_{i+1}^2 - \gamma_{i,1} - \gamma_{i,3}.$$

Set

$$u_1 := \left(\frac{\alpha_{1,1}}{\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,3}}, \frac{\alpha_{1,2}}{\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,3}}, \frac{\alpha_{1,3}}{\alpha_{1,1} + \alpha_{1,2} + \alpha_{1,3}}, 0, ..., 0 \right) \in \mathbb{R}^9, \tag{22}$$

and for $i \leq 0$ define $x_i = \frac{\alpha_{i,1}}{1-\alpha_{i,1}-\alpha_{i,2}-\beta_{i,1}-\beta_{i,2}}$, $y_i = \frac{\alpha_{i,2}}{1-\alpha_{i,1}-\alpha_{i,2}-\beta_{i,1}-\beta_{i,2}}$, $z_i = \frac{\beta_{i,1}}{1-\alpha_{i,1}-\alpha_{i,2}-\beta_{i,1}-\beta_{i,2}}$, $w_i = \frac{\beta_{i,2}}{1-\alpha_{i,1}-\alpha_{i,2}-\beta_{i,1}-\beta_{i,2}}$, $1 - v_i = \frac{\gamma_{i,3}}{\beta_{i+1,2}}$, $s_i = \frac{\alpha_{i,3}}{\alpha_{i,3}+\beta_{i,3}}$ and $t_i = \frac{\gamma_{i,1}}{\gamma_{i,1}+\gamma_{i,2}}$. Define also the matrices

$$Q_i = \begin{pmatrix} x_i & y_i & 0 & z_i & w_i & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_i & y_i & s_i & z_i & w_i & 1-s_i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_i & y_i & 0 & z_i & w_i & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_i & y_i & 0 & z_i & w_i & 0 & t_i & 1-t_i & 0 \\ x_i v_i & y_i v_i & s_i v_i & z_i v_i & w_i v_i & (1-s_i)v_i & t_i v_i & (1-t_i)v_i & 1-v_i \\ x_i & y_i & 0 & z_i & w_i & 0 & t_i & 1-t_i & 0 \\ x_i & y_i & 0 & z_i & w_i & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_i & y_i & s_i & z_i & w_i & 1-s_i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_i & y_i & 0 & z_i & w_i & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{23}$$

We have the following proposition which could be found in [13].

Proposition 2. *Suppose that $\gamma_R \geq 0$. For $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$-a.a. $\tilde{\omega}$, there exists a 9-type branching process $\{Z_n\}$, whose mean offspring matrices are as in (23) and*

initial distribution mean is u_1 defined in (22), such that in $\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}$-distribution, with $\mathbf{v}_1 = (1,1,1,0,0,0,1,1,1)^T$ and $\mathbf{v}_2 = (1,1,0,1,1,0,1,1,0)^T$,

$$\overline{U}_k = Z_{k+1}\mathbf{v}_1 + Z_k\mathbf{v}_2,\ k \le 0.$$

Moreover, with the empty product being identity,

$$\begin{aligned}&\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\overline{U}_k|\chi_{\overline{T}_1}=2) + \tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\overline{U}_k|\chi_{\overline{T}_1}=1)\\ &= \Big(\frac{\alpha_{1,1}}{\alpha_{1,1}+\alpha_{1,2}}, \frac{\alpha_{1,2}}{\alpha_{1,1}+\alpha_{1,2}}, 1, 0, ..., 0\Big)(Q_0Q_{-1}\cdots Q_{k+1}\mathbf{v}_1 + Q_0Q_{-1}\cdots Q_k\mathbf{v}_2).\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Since after the ith visit of state k, $\{N_t\}$ will wait here an exponentially distributed time ξ_{ki} with parameter $\mu_i^1 + \mu_i^2 + \lambda_i^1 + \lambda_i^2$, then given $\tilde{\omega}$, in $\tilde{P}_{\tilde{\omega}}$ distribution,

$$T_1 = \sum_{k\le 0}\sum_{i=1}^{\overline{U}_k} \xi_{ki}.$$

Hence by Ward's equation, it follows from (24) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{r=1}^{2}\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(T_1|N_{T_1}=r) = \sum_{r=1}^{2}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\overline{U}_k|N_{T_1}=r)\tilde{E}_{\tilde{\omega}}(\xi_{k1})\\ &= \sum_{k\le 0}\frac{1}{\mu_k^1+\mu_k^2+\lambda_k^1+\lambda_k^2}\\ &\qquad \times\Big(\frac{\alpha_{1,1}}{\alpha_{1,1}+\alpha_{1,2}}, \frac{\alpha_{1,2}}{\alpha_{1,1}+\alpha_{1,2}}, 1, 0, ..., 0\Big)\\ &\qquad \cdot(Q_0Q_{-1}\cdots Q_{k+1}\mathbf{v}_1 + Q_0Q_{-1}\cdots Q_k\mathbf{v}_2)\\ &=: D(\tilde{\omega})\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{r=1}^{2}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{U_k}\xi_{kj}|N_{T_1}=r\Big)\\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\mu_0^1+\mu_0^2+\lambda_0^1+\lambda_0^2}\\ &\qquad \times\Big(\frac{\alpha_{k+1,1}}{\alpha_{k+1,1}+\alpha_{k+1,2}}, \frac{\alpha_{k+1,2}}{\alpha_{k+1,1}+\alpha_{k+1,2}}, 1, 0, ..., 0\Big)\\ &\qquad \cdot(Q_kQ_{k-1}\cdots Q_1\mathbf{v}_1 + Q_kQ_{k-1}\cdots Q_0\mathbf{v}_2)\\ &=: \pi(\tilde{\omega}).\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Substituting (25) and (26) to (1), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} v_{\tilde{\mathbb{P}}} &= \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\Big(\sum_{r=1}^{2}\sum_{k\le 0}\tilde{E}_{\theta^{-k}\tilde{\omega}}\big(\sum_{j=1}^{U_k}\xi_{kj}|N_{T_1}=r\big)(2\lambda_0^2+\lambda_0^1-\mu_0^1-2\mu_0^2)\Big)}{\sum_{r=1}^{R}\tilde{E}(T_1|N_{T_1}=r)} \\ &= \frac{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}\left(\pi(\tilde{\omega})(2\lambda_0^2+\lambda_0^1-\mu_0^1-2\mu_0^2)\right)}{\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(D(\tilde{\omega}))}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Appendix: On the existence of $\{N_t\}$

Given $\tilde{\omega}$, let $Q=(q_{ij})$ be a matrix with

$$q_{ij}=\begin{cases} \lambda_i^r, & \text{if } j=i+r,\ r=1,...,R; \\ \mu_i^l, & \text{if } j=i-l,\ l=1,...,L; \\ -\big(\sum_{i=1}^{L}\mu_i^l+\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_i^r\big), & \text{if } j=i; \\ 0, & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Then Q is obviously a conservative Q-matrix. Note that under (C2), Q is bounded from above. Hence the process $\{N_t\}$ exists (See for example Anderson [2], Proposition 2.9, Chapter 2.). Next we give a condition which implies the existence of $\{N_t\}$ but is weaker than (C2). We have from classical argument that there exists at least one transition matrix $(\overline{p}_{\tilde{\omega}}(t,i,j))$ such that

$$\lim_{t\to 0}\frac{\overline{p}_{\tilde{\omega}}(t,i,j)-\delta_{ij}}{t}=q_{ij},\ i,j\in\mathbb{Z}. \tag{27}$$

Let $(p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,i,j))$ be a standard transition matrix satisfying (27). Let $\{N_t\}$ be a continuous time Markov chain with transition matrix $(p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,i,j))$. Let $\tau_0=0$ and define $\tau_n:=\inf\{t>\tau_{n-1}:N_t\neq N_{\tau_{n-1}}\}$ recursively for $n\ge 1$. Then $\tau_n, n\ge 0$ are the consecutive discontinuities of the process $\{N_t\}$. If

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_0^l+\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_0^r>0\Big)=1,$$

then $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\tau_n<\infty, n\ge 0$. Let $\chi_n=N_{\tau_n}$, for $n\ge 0$. The process $\{\chi_n\}_{n\ge 0}$ is known as the embedded process of $\{N_t\}$.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that* $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big(\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_0^l+\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_0^r>0\big)=1$ *and*

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\Big(\max_{1\le k\le R}\Big\{\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_{nR-k}^r+\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_{nR-k}^l\Big\}\Big)^{-1}=\infty\Big)=1,$$

$$\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\Big(\sum_{n=-\infty}^{0}\Big(\max_{1\le k\le L}\Big\{\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_{nL-k}^r+\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_{nL-k}^l\Big\}\Big)^{-1}=\infty\Big)=1.$$

Then for $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}$*-a.a.* $\tilde{\omega}$*, there is a unique transition matrix* $(p_{\tilde{\omega}}(h,i,j))$ *which satisfies (27).*

Proof. Considering the above defined $\{N_t\}$, since $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}\big(\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_0^l+\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_0^r>0\big)=1$, we have $\tilde{P}$-a.s., $\tau_n<\infty, n\ge 1$. By the classical argument of the uniqueness of the Q-process, if

$$\tilde{P}(\lim_{n\to\infty}\tau_n=\infty)=1,$$

then the minimal solution $p_{\tilde{\omega}}(t,i,j)$ is the unique Q-transition matrix. Let $q_i=-q_{ii},\ i\in\mathbb{Z}$. If

$$\tilde{P}\Big(\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}q_{\chi_n}^{-1}=\infty\Big)=1, \tag{28}$$

then we have (see Chung [8], Theorem 1 in II.19) that $\tilde{P}(\lim_{n\to\infty}\tau_n=\infty)=1$. Next we show (28). In fact, if the process $\{\chi_n\}_{n\ge 0}$ is recurrent or transient to the right, it must visit at least one state of each of the sets $B_n:=\{nR-k\}_{k=1}^{R}, n=1,2,....$ Then $\tilde{P}$-a.s.,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}q_{\chi_n}^{-1}\ge\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\Big(\max_{1\le k\le R}\Big\{\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_{nR-k}^r+\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_{nR-k}^l\Big\}\Big)^{-1}=\infty.$$

Else if the process $\{\chi_n\}_{n\ge 0}$ is transient to the left, it must visit at least one state of each of the sets $A_n:=\{nL-k\}_{k=1}^{L}, n=0,-1,-2,....$ It follows that P-a.s.,

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}q_{\chi_n}^{-1}\ge\sum_{n=-\infty}^{0}\Big(\max_{1\le k\le L}\Big\{\sum_{r=1}^{R}\lambda_{nL-k}^r+\sum_{l=1}^{L}\mu_{nL-k}^l\Big\}\Big)^{-1}=\infty.$$

Consequently (28) follows. □

Acknowledgements: The author would like to thank Professor Wenming Hong for his useful comments on the paper.

References

[1] S. Alili, Asymptotic behavior for random walks in random environments, J. Appl. Probab. 36 (1999) 334-349.

[2] W. J. Anderson, Continuous-time Markov chains: an applications-oriented approach, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[3] E. D. Andjel, A zero or one law for one dimensional random walks in random environments, Ann. Probab. 16(2) (1988) 722-729.

[4] E. Bolthausen, I. Goldsheid, Recurrence and transience of random walks in random environments on a strip, Commun. Math. Phys. 214 (2000) 429-447.

[5] J. Brémont, Random walks on Z in random medium and Lyapunov spectrum, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 40(3) (2004) 309-336.

[6] J. Brémont, One-dimensional finite range random walk in random medium and invariant measure equation, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 45 (2009) 70-103.

[7] F. Comets, S. Popov, Ballistic regime for random walks in random environment with unbounded jumps and Knudsen billiards, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist. 48(3) (2012) 721-744.

[8] K. L. Chung, Markov chains with stationary transition probabilities, Springer-Verlag, 1960.

[9] R. Durrett, Probability: theory and examples, 2nd Ed., Duxbury Press, Belmont, 1996.

[10] C. Gallesco, S. Popov, Random walks with unbounded jumps among random conductances I: Uniform quenched CLT, Electron. J. Probab. 17(85) (2012) 1-22.

[11] C. Gallesco, S. Popov, Random walks with unbounded jumps among random conductances II: Conditional quenched CLT, arXiv:1210.0591v2, 2013.

[12] W. M. Hong, H. M. Wang, Intrinsic branching structure within (L-1) random walk in random environment and its applications, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. 16 (2013) 1350006 [14 pages].

[13] W. M. Hong, H. M. Wang, Intrinsic branching structure within random walk on Z, To appear in Theory of Probability and Its Applications, 2014.

[14] W. M. Hong, L. Zhang, Branching structure for the transient (1; R)-random walk in random environment and its applications, Infin. Dimens. Anal. Quantum Probab. Relat. Top. 13(4) (2010) 589-618.

[15] E. S. Key, Recurrence and transience criteria for random walk in a random environment, Ann. Probab. 12 (1984) 529-560.

[16] S. M. Kozlov, The method of averaging and walks in inhomogeneous environments, Russian Math. Surveys 40 (1985) 73-145.

[17] E. Lesigne, D. Volný, Large deviations for martingales, Stochastic Process, Appl. 96 (2001) 143-159.

[18] A. V. Letchikov, Localization of one-dimensional random walks in random environments, Sov. Sci. Rev. C. Math. Phys. 8 (1989) 173-220.

[19] V. I. Oseledec, Multiplicative ergodic theorem. Characteristic Lyapunov exponents of dynamic systems, Trudy Moskovskogo Matemaricheskogo Obshchestva 19 (1968) 179-210.

[20] G. Ritter, A continuous-time analogue of random walk in a random environment, J. Appl. Probab. 17 (1980) 259-264.

[21] A. Roitershtein, Transient random walks on a strip in a random environment, Ann. Probab. 36(6) (2008) 2354-2387.

[22] F. Solomon, Random walks in a random environment, Ann. Probab. 3 (1975) 1-31.

[23] A. S. Sznitman, Lectures on random motions in random media, In DMV seminar 32, Birkhauser, Basel, 2002.

[24] H. M. Wang, Birth and death process with one-side bounded jumps in random environment, arXiv:1407.3385, 2014.

[25] O. Zeitouni, Random walks in random environment, LNM 1837, J. Picard (Ed.), 189-312, Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2004.